

REMARKS

IN RE APPLICATION OF:

Applicant:	Akihiro Ouchi	Conf.:	3512
Appl. No.:	10/658,958	Art Unit:	2629
Filed:	9 Sept. 2003	Examiner:	SHERMAN, STEPHEN G
For:	DISPLAY APPARATUS, METHOD OF CONTROLLING THE SAME, AND MULTIDISPLAY SYSTEM		

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I.	CLAIM AMENDMENTS	2
II.	INTERVIEW REQUEST.....	11
III.	STATUS OF CLAIMS (37 C.F.R. § 1.192(C)(3))	11
IV.	SUMMARY OF THE INVENTION (37 C.F.R. § 1.192(C)(5)).....	11
V.	THE GROUNDS OF REJECTION	11
VI.	THE ISSUES	11
VII.	THE LEGAL REQUIREMENTS OF <i>PRIMA FACIE</i> OBVIOUSNESS	12
VIII.	DISCUSSION OF CITED ART.....	12
IX.	EXAMINER'S REJECTION OF INDEPENDENT CLAIMS 1, 9, AND 16	13
X.	ARGUMENTS (37 C.F.R. § 1.192(C)(8))	13
XI.	CONCLUSION.....	16

II. INTERVIEW REQUEST

Applicant contends that the present response places the pending claims in condition for allowance, however if the Examiner is not so convinced, Applicant respectfully requests an interview to discuss any outstanding issues needed to place the Application in condition for allowance. The Examiner may contact Dr. John P. Keady at (703) 807-3055 in the Washington D.C. Metro Area at his convenience to schedule an interview.

III. STATUS OF CLAIMS (37 C.F.R. § 1.192(C)(3))

Claims 1-18 are now pending, Claims 1, 9, and 16 are independent. Claims 1-9, and 11-16, have been amended.

IV. SUMMARY OF THE INVENTION (37 C.F.R. § 1.192(C)(5))

At least one exemplary embodiment is directed to an image display apparatus, comprising: input/output means for transferring image data input from a first image display device having a display unit, where the first image display device is disposed at an upstream location to a second image display device; acquisition means for acquiring resolution information of the second image display device; generation means for generating resolution information on the basis of the resolution information acquired by the acquisition means and a resolution of the display unit; and first storage means for storing the generated resolution information.

V. THE GROUNDS OF REJECTION

The Examiner has rejected all pending claims as follows:

(1) Claims 1, 3-9, and 11-16 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Furuhashi et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,583,771) in view of Ogino et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,593,902).

(2) Claims 2, 10, and 17-18 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Furuhashi et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,583,771) in view of Ogino et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,593,902), and further in view of Shirasaki et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,943,753).

VI. ISSUES (37 C.F.R. § 1.192(C)(6))

The issues to be resolved in this response are:

(1) The rejection fails to establish *prima facie* obviousness of independent claims 1, 9, and 16, and dependent claims 3-8, and 11-15; and

(2) The rejection fails to establish *prima facie* obviousness of dependent claims 2, 10, and 17-18.

VII. THE LEGAL REQUIREMENTS OF *PRIMA FACIE* OBVIOUSNESS

To establish *prima facie* obviousness, all claim limitations must be taught or suggested by the prior art and the asserted modification or combination of the prior art must be supported by some teaching, suggestion or motivation in the applied references or in knowledge generally available to one skilled in the art. In re Fine, 837 F.2d 1071, 5 USPQ2d 1596 (Fed. Cir. 1988); In re Jones, 958 F.2d 347, 21 USPQ2d 1941 (Fed. Cir. 1992). The prior art must suggest the desirability of the modification in order to establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness. In re Brouwer, 77 F.3d 422, 425, 37 USPQ2d 1663, 1666 (Fed. Cir. 1995). It can also be said that the prior art must collectively suggest or point to the claimed invention to support the findings of obviousness. In re Hedges, 783 F.2d 1038, 1041, 228 USPQ, 685, 687 (Fed. Cir. 1986); In re Ehrreich, 590 F.2d 902, 908-909, 200 USPQ 504, 510 (C.C.P.A. 1979).

To establish obviousness based on the combination of elements disclosed in the prior art there must be some motivation, suggestion, or teaching, and the desirability of making the specific combination that was made by the Applicant. The motivation, suggestion, or teaching may come explicitly from the statements in the prior art, the knowledge of one of ordinary skill in the art, or in some cases, the nature of the problem to be solved. In re Dembiczak, 50 USPQ2d 1614 (Fed. Cir. 1999). In order to establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a), the Examiner must provide particular findings as to why the two pieces of prior art are combinable. See Dembiczak, 50 USPQ2d at 1617. Broad conclusionary statements standing alone are not “evidence.”

VIII. DISCUSSION OF CITED ART

FURUHASHI ET AL. (U.S. PATENT NO. 6,583,771)

As stated by the Examiner (Final Office Action, pg. 3, 15 August 2006) “Furuhashi discusses the input of the resolution of the display data to the controller of the image display devices and does not teach ...an acquisition means that acquires the resolution of the image display device...” (emphasis added). Additionally the Examiner

states “Furuhashi et al. fail[s] to teach ...an image display device having a display unit, comprising: acquisition means for acquiring resolution information associated with the image display device disposed at the downstream location; and first storage means for storing the generated resolution information for supply to the image display device disposed at the upstream location...” (Final Office Action, pg. 5, 15 August 2006) (emphasis added).

OGINO ET AL. (U.S. PATENT NO. 6,593,902)

As stated by the Examiner (Final Office Action, pg. 2, 15 August 2006) “Ogino discusses the resolution of a screen and not the resolution of an individual display unit [of an image device]...” (emphasis added).

IX. EXAMINER’S REJECTION OF INDEPENDENT CLAIMS 1, 9, AND 16

In rejection of independent claims 1, 9, and 16, and dependent claims 3-8, and 11-15, the Examiner relies on the primary reference Furuhashi et al., as allegedly disclosing an image display apparatus, which allegedly discloses most of the elements of the pending claims. The Examiner acknowledges that “Furuhashi et al. fail[s] to teach ...an image display device having a display unit, comprising: acquisition means for acquiring resolution information associated with the image display device disposed at the downstream location; and first storage means for storing the generated resolution information for supply to the image display device disposed at the upstream location...”

The Examiner alleges Ogino et al. discloses the missing elements of claims 1, 3-9, and 11-16 not shown by Furuhashi et al. The Examiner alleges “that it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to use the input/output control method of acquiring information between adjacent display devices...” as allegedly taught by Ogino et al. “with the multidisplay control system taught by Furuhashi et al. in order to provide an extending type of display device.... (Final Office Action, pg. 6, 15 August 2006).

X. ARGUMENTS (37 C.F.R. § 1.192(C)(8))

- (1) The rejection fails to establish *prima facie* obviousness of independent claims 1, 9, and 16, and dependent claims 3-8, and 11-15**

Argument Summary

The reasoning provided in support of the rejection of claims 1, 9, and 16 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Furuhashi in view of Ogino fails to establish *prima facie* obviousness. Generally, the deficiencies of the rejection are that:

a. The rejection attributes certain claimed features to the secondary reference Ogino, which the Examiner has indicated are not taught therein. These features are also not shown, taught, or suggested in the primary or other secondary references.

Issue (1) Argument

The Examiner has indicated that Ogino fails to discuss the resolution of an individual display unit [of an image device] (Final Office Action, pg. 2, 15 August 2006). Applicant directs the Examiner's attention to amended independent claims 1, 9, and 16 which have been amended for clarity, and which clearly refer to the "resolution of a second display device having a second display unit..." As stated in a previous response, a screen in Ogino is defined as the accumulation of display units (i.e. display units of display devices) where the resolution of the screen is defined as the number of areas in the screen, not the resolution of an individual display unit. For Example with reference to Figures 7B, and 8A-8D Ogino states:

It should be noted that, when 16 display units 101A to 101Q constitute the screen, as shown in FIG. 7B, each of the display units can also recognize a size of the screen...(Ogino, col. 7, ll. 41-43, emphasis added)

FIG. 8A shows an entire screen obtained by connecting a plurality of display units 101 to each other, and shows a state of the entire screen recognized as one area (in other words, one pixel). In this case, the number of dividing times of the screen is "0", and display resolution (in other words, the number of areas: resolution) is "1", and the number of bits required for an address for specifying this area is "0" (which indicates only one area). (Ogino, col. 7, ll. 60-67, emphasis added)

When any address information is to be set, at first, the screen shown in FIG. 8A is divided into four areas as shown in FIG. 8B, and first area addresses with two bits of "00", "01", "10", "11" each correlated to each position of the divided screens (areas a to d) are appended to the first areas' respective addresses. In this case, the number of dividing times of the screen is "1", display resolution (in other words, the number of areas) is "4", ... (Ogino, col. 8, ll. 1-8, emphasis added)

Thus as stated above, Ogino discusses the resolution of a screen, not the resolution of a display unit. As stated previously, in the Final Office Action the Examiner has agreed that Ogino fails to discuss the resolution of an individual display unit. Thus, Ogino fails to teach, show, and/or suggest all the elements missing, from the primary reference of Furuhashi, of amended claims 1, 9, and 16.

Clearly from the discussion above the Examiner has failed to meet the burden of showing that Furuhashi, even in combination with Ogino (although Applicant does not admit either reference is combinable), shows, suggests, or teaches all of the features of amended claim 1, and for the same reasons as above, amended claims 9 and 16.

Claims 2-8, and 11-15, depend either directly or indirectly on amended claims 1 and 9, and for the same reasons as above, Furuhashi, even in combination with Ogino (although Applicant does not admit either reference is combinable), fails to show, suggest, or teach all of the features of claims 2-8, and 11-15.

Accordingly Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the outstanding rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a).

(2) The rejection fails to establish *prima facie* obviousness of Dependent Claims 2, 10, and 17-18.

Argument Summary

The reasoning provided in support of the rejection of claims 2, 10, and 17-18 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Furuhashi in view of Ogino and further in view of Shirasaki et al. fails to establish *prima facie* obviousness. Generally, the deficiencies of the rejection are that:

a. The rejection attributes certain claimed features to the secondary reference Ogino, which the Examiner has indicated are not taught therein. These features are also not shown, taught, or suggested in the primary or other secondary references.

Issue (2) Argument

Applicant has already explained why Furuhashi in view of Ogino (assuming they are combinable, which Applicant does not admit) fails to teach, suggest, or show all the elements of independent amended claims 1, 9, and 16.

Clearly from the discussion above the Examiner has failed to meet the burden of showing that Furuhashi, even in combination with Ogino (although Applicant does not admit either reference is combinable), shows, suggests, or teaches all of the features of claims 1, 9 and 16. Additionally, the Examiner has failed to indicate where in Shirasaki et al., the features discussed above which are not shown by Furuhashi and Ogino are shown, suggested or taught in Shirasaki et al.

Claims 2, 10, and 17-18, depend either directly or indirectly on amended claims 1, 9, and 16, and for the same reasons as above, Furuhashi, even in combination with Ogino and Shirasaki et al. (although Applicant does not admit any of the references are combinable), fails to show, suggest, or teach all of the features of claims 2, 10, and 17-18.

Accordingly Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the outstanding rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a).

XI. CONCLUSION

For all the reasons set forth above, the Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and withdrawal of all rejections to the claims. Because all claims are believed to define over prior art of record, Applicant respectfully requests an early indication of allowability.

If the Examiner has any questions concerning this application, the Examiner is requested to contact the undersigned at (703) 807-3055 in the Washington, D.C. Metro area.

If necessary, the Commissioner is hereby authorized in this, concurrent, and future replies, to charge payment or credit any overpayments to Deposit Account No. 50-2456 for any additional fees required under 37 C.F.R. §§1.16 or 1.17; particularly, extension of time fees.

Very truly yours,

Canon U.S.A. Inc.
Intellectual Property Department

By _____/John P. Keady/

John P. Keady, PhD, Esq.
Reg. No. 56,389
15975 Alton Parkway
Irvine, CA 92618-3731
(703) 807-3055

JPK/tt